UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/929,442 | 08/14/2001 | Christian Linhart | 218.1023 | 8785 |

23280 7590 01/05/2004

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC
485 SEVENTH AVENUE, 14TH FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10018

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| LEWIS, CHERYL RENEA | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2177 | 5 |

DATE MAILED: 01/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PR4

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 09/929,442 | LINHART, CHRISTIAN | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Cheryl Lewis | 2177 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 August 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-53* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-53* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

## DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-53 are presented for examination.

## DRAWINGS

2. The applicant's drawings filed on August 14, 2001 have been objected to by the draftsperson. Refer to the attached PTO-948.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 2, 4, 15, 16, 24, 25, 27, 38, 39, 47-49, and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Driscoll (Pat. No. 5,717,913, filed January 3, 1995).

5. Regarding Claim 1, 24, 47, 48, and 49, Driscoll teaches a method for detecting and extracting text data using data schemas.

The method and associated system for a method for detecting and extracting text data using data schemas as taught or suggested by Driscoll includes:

receiving a definition of a filter configuration (col. 2, lines 1-40); modifying the input text stream according to the filter configuration so as to generate a filter text

stream (col. 2, lines 14-33), the filtered text stream including positioning information for the input text stream (col. 2, lines 52-67, col. 3, lines 1-30, col. 5, lines 13-43 and 51-67).

6. Regarding Claims 2 and 25, Driscoll teaches receiving a definition of a plurality of patterns (col. 5, lines 51-67, col. 6, lines 1-53, col. 7, lines 5-30); and receiving a definition of a respective association between each of the plurality of patterns and a respective executable action (figure 3, elements 110-230).

7. Regarding Claims 4 and 27, Driscoll teaches processing and comparing are performed in a same active process (col. 3, lines 60-67, col. 4, lines 1-14).

8. Regarding Claims 15 and 38, Driscoll teaches positioning information refers to characters (col. 6, lines 22-37).

9. Regarding Claims 16, 39, and 51, Driscoll teaches positioning information includes directives (col. 6, lines 45-53).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

11. Claims 3, 17-19, 22, 23, 26, 40-42, 45, 46, 52, and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Driscoll (Pat. No. 5,717,913, filed January 3, 1995) as applied to claims 1, 24, and 49 above, and further in view of Iguchi et al. (Pat. No. 5,590,317, filed May 27, 1993, hereinafter Iguchi).

12. Regarding Claims 3 and 26, Driscoll teaches processing the plurality of patterns and the respective association to a data structure (col. 5, lines 51-67, col. 6, lines 1-16 and 22-32) capable of comparing the input text stream to at least one of the plurality of patterns (col. 3, lines 60-67, col. 4, lines 1-14, col. 5, lines 51-67, col. 6, lines 1-16 and 22-32) and execution of the action upon a match of the input text stream (col. 3, lines 60-67, col. 4, lines 1-14). However, Driscoll does not expressly teach a scanner.

Iguchi teaches a scanner data structure capable of comparing the input text stream to at least one of the plurality of patterns and causing execution of associated executable action upon a match of the input text stream with the respective one the plurality of patterns (col. 21, lines 27-47, col. 22, lines 27-54, col. 23, lines 4-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Information Filtering system of Driscoll with the document retrieval method of Iguchi because Iguchi's method enables registering document information in a document information retrieval system which stores document information consisting of a large number of characters for retrieval of the

stored document information, further entered document information is separated into words, whether or not each of the words is a word to which a compressed code is assigned is determined, if not already assigned, a compressed code is assigned to the word, the words are converted into the assigned compressed codes for storing a compressed text (Abstract, lines 4-13).

13. Regarding Claims 17 and 40, Iguchi teaches executable actions being executable by a scanner (col. 21, lines 27-47, col. 22, lines 27-54, col. 23, lines 4-55).

14. Regarding Claims 18, 19, 41, 42, 52, and 53, Iguchi teaches means which essentially comprise the same means as a modified scanner generator skeleton configured to receive text stream (col. 21, lines 27-47, col. 22, lines 27-54, col. 23, lines 4-55).

15. Regarding Claims 22, 23, 45, and 46, the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection above. In addition, Iguchi teaches a plurality of start states (col. 15, lines 55-67) and a current start state (col. 16, lines 1-14).

16. Claims 5-14, 28-37, and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Driscoll (Pat. No. 5,717,913, filed January 3, 1995) as applied to claims 1, 24, and 49 above, and further in view of Smith et al. (Pat. No. 6,327,561 B1, filed July 7, 1999, hereinafter Smith).

17. Regarding Claims 5 and 28, Driscoll does not expressly teach replacement text. However, Smith teaches replacement text (Abstract, lines 13-17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Driscoll's Information Filtering system with the

customized tokenization method of Smith because Smith's customized tokenization method enables tokenizing the domain-specific text using the loaded domain-specific tokenization rules, wherein the tokenizing step can comprise identifying each substring in the domain-specific text matching a regular expressing having a corresponding replacement pattern in the loaded domain-specific tokenization rules, and replacing each substring identified in the identifying step with the replacement pattern corresponding to the matched regular expression (Abstract, lines 1-17).

18. Regarding Claims 6, 10, 29, and 33, Smith teaches the replacement text is determined dynamically (Abstract, lines 1-17).

19. Regarding Claims 7 and 30, Driscoll teaches the respective executable action (figure 3, elements 110-230).

20. Regarding Claims 8 and 31, Smith teaches the replacement text is determined using at least a portion of the matched text (Abstract, lines 1-26).

21. Regarding Claims 9 and 32, Smith teaches replacing at least one character in the input text stream with a replacement text (figure 4B, elements 42 and 45).

22. Regarding Claims 11 and 34, Smith teaches the replacement text is determined using at least a portion of the matched text (Abstract, lines 1-16).

23. Regarding Claims 12 and 35, Driscoll teaches comparing the input text stream to a plurality of patterns upon a match of the input text stream with the respective one of the plurality of patterns (col. 3, lines 60-67, col. 4, lines 1-14, col. 5, lines 51-67, col. 6, lines 1-16 and 22-32).

24. Regarding Claims 13, 14, 36, 37, and 50, Driscoll teaches the input text stream includes determining a difference in a number of characters (col. 6, lines 44-53).

25. Claims 20, 21, 43, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Driscoll (Pat. No. 5,717,913, filed January 3, 1995) and Iguchi et al. (Pat. No. 5,590,317, filed May 27, 1993, hereinafter Iguchi) as applied to claims 18, 19, 41, and 42 above, and further in view of Carus (Pat. No. 5,890,103, filed July 19, 1996).

26. Regarding Claims 20, 21, 43, 44, Driscoll and Iguchi do not expressly teach a parser.

However, Carus teaches a parser (Abstract, lines 1-8, figure 18, element 430).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the information retrieval methods of Driscoll and Iguchi with the information retrieval method of Carus because Carus' information retrieval method enables providing a tokenizing apparatus that parses natural language text in a manner that increases the throughput of an information retrieval or natural language analysis system, the tokenizer includes a parser that extracts characters from the stream of text, an identifying element for identifying a token formed of characters in the stream of text that include lexical matter, and a filter for assigning tags to those tokens requiring further linguistic analysis.

## CONCLUSION

27. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

A. Hoffman, Jr. et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,615,266 B1) discloses internet computer system with methods for dynamic filtering of hypertext tags and content; and

B. Nanjo et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,778,361) discloses a method and system for fast indexing and searching of text in compound-word languages.

## NAME OF CONTACT

28. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cheryl Lewis whose telephone number is (703) 305-8750. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

(703) 746-5651 (Use this FAX #, only after approval by Examiner, for "INFORMAL" or "DRAFT" communication. Examiners may request that a formal paper/amendment be faxed directly to them on occasions.).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Cheryl Lewis
Patent Examiner
December 23, 2003

JOHN BREENE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100